



A STUDY ON SOCIAL-EMOTIONAL COMPETENCY AND TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS OF SECONDARY SCHOOL TEACHERS IN MEGHALAYA

Welbirthstone L. Nonglait

Research Scholar

Department of Education

North-Eastern Hill University, Shillong

Dr. Eoudia B. Myrthong

Assistant Professor

Department of Education

North-Eastern Hill University, Shillong

Abstract

The purpose of the research is to find out the levels of Social-Emotional Competency, categories in Teaching Effectiveness and the relationship between these teaching variables, so that ways and means for improvement towards the secondary school teachers in the state could be developed. In pursuing the study, the investigator employed descriptive design. The population consisted of 2334 secondary school teachers from East Khasi Hills, West Khasi Hills and Ri Bhoi Districts of Meghalaya. From this population, the sample of 744 secondary school teachers was drawn. The study was delimited only to the secondary school teachers in the three districts included of Government, Deficit and Adhoc secondary school teachers. In conducting the tests the investigators used: (i) Teachers' Social-Emotional Competency Scale (TSECS) constructed and standardised by the investigator, (ii) Teacher Effectiveness Scale by Umme Kulsum (2000, Re-edited: 2011). The findings of the study revealed that: (i) majority (23.66%) of secondary school teachers are average and beyond in Social-Emotional Competency, (ii) majority (67.34%) of secondary school teachers are most effective in teaching, (iii) there is a difference in Social-Emotional Competency between male and female secondary school teachers, (iv) there is no significant difference in Social-Emotional Competency between rural and urban secondary school teachers, (v) Social-Emotional Competency of secondary school teachers in Government, Deficit and Adhoc do not differ from one another, (vi) Social-Emotional Competency of secondary school teachers based on teaching experiences do not differ from one another, (vii) there is a difference in Teaching Effectiveness between male and female secondary school teachers, (viii) there is a difference in Teaching Effectiveness between rural and urban secondary school teachers, (ix) There is a difference in Teaching Effectiveness between types of school management of secondary school teachers, (x) it was also found that there was no significant difference in Teaching Effectiveness based on teaching experiences except for teachers with 1-5 years and 11-15 years of teaching experiences, (xi) there is a positive relationship between Teachers' Social-Emotional Competency and Teaching Effectiveness of secondary school teachers.

Key words: Social-Emotional Competency, Teaching Effectiveness, Secondary School Teachers

Introduction

Teaching is an activity, which contributes to the natural development of an individual. It involves, “perceiving the process analytically as constituting a host of activity” (Bhattacharya, 1974, p.17). The ultimate aim of teaching is imparting knowledge and bringing about desirable modification in the learner’s behaviour (Kumar, 2012). Teachers as mediators (Moll, 2003) are the pivot that regulates the learning situation in the classroom which its main purpose is to induce effective learning for successful classroom outcomes (Alhassan, 2015). Since, classroom is a social situation, teachers’ interest, self-concept, skills and instructional abilities only would not bring sufficient knowledge of effective teaching. Therefore, in order to create healthy learning classroom, teachers’ social-emotional competency is indispensable. It is believed that a socially and emotionally competent teacher possesses high self-awareness, social awareness and exhibit good interrelationship values. A socially and emotionally competent teacher is also culturally sensitive and understands that others may have different perspectives than they do and take this into account in his/her relationships with others (Jennings & Greenberg, 2009). When teachers experienced mastery over these social and emotional challenges, teaching becomes more enjoyable, and they feel more efficacious and know how to manage their emotions, their behaviour and also how to manage relationships with students (Goddard, Hoy, & Woolfolk, 2004). Thus, Social-Emotional Competency affects and influences both teaching and learning situation in classroom.

Need and Justification

Teachers are considered as the pillars in the educational system. They are responsible for which the knowledge can be facilitated to the students who represent the foundation of the society. The study of Social-Emotional Competency of secondary school teachers in Meghalaya becomes significant on the basis that Social-Emotional Competency plays an important role in teaching-learning situation and influences the personal competency of a teacher. Teaching is a dynamic interplay between teacher and pupil. Therefore, it is expected that each and every secondary school teacher of the state must have adequate training of teaching skills and its effective implementation. These skills will enhance the classroom interest and active participation of the students in classroom activities. In order to deal with the problems of the students of the state, a teacher must also possess social and emotional competence to enable him to sense the slightest changes in the classroom and can maneuver the teaching strategies accordingly. An emotionally competent teacher is the heart and soul of successful educational programme. Thus, in order to identify and develop such characteristics in the secondary school teachers, one needs to assess the influence of teachers’ Social-Emotional Competency in relation to classroom behaviour. Therefore, the investigation on this area will help teachers in all the spheres of life, especially in imparting the knowledge and raising the quality of life of the young adolescents. Hence, it is justified to investigate the problem with a view to provide factual findings, suggestions and remedial measures for improvement.

Operational Definition of the Terms Used

(i) *Teachers’ Social-Emotional Competency*: This refers to the ability of the teachers to socially and emotionally adapt and adjust themselves to the classroom environment. It involves teacher’s ability to self regulate and manage emotions, to articulate interpersonal knowledge and skills, the ability to discern and understand others and the ability to interact effectively with people from different cultural background.

(ii) *Teaching Effectiveness*: It refers to the process of teaching in which teachers have attained the needed competence in their roles and functions such as the preparation and planning for teaching, classroom management, knowledge of subject matter, teacher characteristics and their interpersonal relations (Kulsum, 2000).

Research Questions

1. Are secondary school teachers socially and emotionally competent?
2. Do secondary school teachers possess Teaching Effectiveness?

Objectives of the Study

1. To study the Social-Emotional Competency and Teaching Effectiveness of secondary school teachers.
2. To find out the difference in Social-Emotional Competency among the following groups:
 - (a) male and female
 - (b) rural and urban
 - (c) types of school management
 - (d) teaching experiences
3. To find out the difference in Teaching Effectiveness among the following groups:
 - (a) male and female
 - (b) rural and urban
 - (c) types of school management
 - (d) teaching experiences
4. To study the relationship between teachers' Social-Emotional Competency and Teaching Effectiveness.

Hypotheses

H₀₁ There is no significant difference in the Social-Emotional Competency between male and female secondary school teachers.

H₀₂ There is no significant difference in the Social-Emotional Competency between rural and urban secondary school teachers.

H₀₃ There is no significant difference in the Social-Emotional Competency between types of school management of secondary school teachers

H₀₄ There is no significant difference in the Social-Emotional Competency between teaching experiences of secondary school teachers

H₀₅ There is no significant difference in Teaching Effectiveness between male and female secondary school teachers

H₀₆ There is no significant difference in Teaching Effectiveness between rural and urban secondary school teachers.

H₀₇ There is no significant difference in Teaching Effectiveness between types of school management of secondary school teachers

H₀₈ There is no significant difference in Teaching Effectiveness between teaching experiences of secondary school teachers

H₀₉ There is no significant relationship between teachers' Social-Emotional Competency and Teaching Effectiveness of secondary school teachers.

Delimitation of the Study

The area of the present study was delimited only to teachers teaching class IX and X in the three districts of Meghalaya that is, West Khasi Hills District, East Khasi Hills District and Ri Bhoi District.

Methodology

Descriptive method was used in the process of conducting study. The population was consisted of 2334 secondary school teachers, which the samples of 744 secondary school teachers were selected from the population using simple random sampling technique. Further, the following tools were used for collection of the necessary information: (i) Teachers' Social-Emotional Competency Scale (TSECS) constructed and standardised by the investigator, (ii) Teacher Effectiveness Scale by Umme Kulsum (2000, Re-edited: 2011). The data was analysed by using appropriate statistical techniques such as, Percentage, '*t*' test, '*F*' test, chi-square and correlation of coefficient '*r*'.

Analysis and Interpretation

Objective 1: To study the Social-Emotional Competency and Teaching Effectiveness of secondary school teachers

In order to study the Social-Emotional Competency and Teaching Effectiveness of secondary school teachers the data was analysed and interpreted using descriptive statistics such as percentage based on the norms. The data was analysed and interpreted as follow:

(a) To study the Social-Emotional Competency of secondary school teachers

Research Question1: Are secondary school teachers socially and emotionally competent?

Social-Emotional Competency of secondary school teachers was analysed based on the norms of percentile rank. The norms are expressed in frequency and percentage as shown in Table No. 1.1

Table No. 1.1

Percentage in Social-Emotional Competency of secondary school teachers

Percentile Rank (PR)	Frequency	Percentage (%)	Description
P ₉₄ – P ₁₀₀	140	18.82%	High
P ₉₀ – P ₉₄	150	20.16%	Above Average
P ₈₅ – P ₉₀	176	23.66%	Average
P ₆₂ – P ₈₅	145	19.49%	Below Average
P ₀ – P ₆₂	133	17.87%	Low

Referring to Table No. 1.1, it is found that 18.82% of the secondary school teachers fall within the percentile rank of P₉₄ - P₁₀₀ which indicates high Social-Emotional Competency. 20.16% of the teachers fall between the percentile rank of P₉₀ - P₉₄ which indicates that they are above average in Social-Emotional Competency. 23.66% of secondary school teachers fall between the percentile rank of P₈₅ - P₉₀ which implies average Social-Emotional Competency and between P₆₂ - P₈₅ percentile rank shows that 19.49% of secondary school teachers possessed below average Social-Emotional Competency. It is also observed that 17.87% of

secondary school teachers fall within percentile rank $P_0 - P_{62}$ which indicates low Social-Emotional Competency. This implies that majority (23.66%) of secondary school teachers are average in Social-Emotional Competency. Overall, it indicates that the Teachers' Social-Emotional Competency of secondary school teachers in Meghalaya is beyond average.

(b) To study the Teaching Effectiveness of secondary school teachers

Research Question 2: Do secondary school teachers possess Teaching Effectiveness?

Teaching Effectiveness of secondary school teachers was analysed based on range of raw scores. The norms are expressed in frequency and percentage as shown in Table No. 1.2.

Table No. 1.2

Percentage in Teaching Effectiveness of secondary school teachers

Range of raw scores	Frequency	Percentage (%)	Description
435 and more	501	67.34%	Most Effective
401 - 434	112	15.06%	Highly Effective
367 - 400	53	7.12%	Above Average Effective
321 - 366	35	4.70%	Moderately Effective
287 - 320	21	2.82%	Below Average Effective
253 - 286	16	2.15%	Very Ineffective
252 and below	6	0.81%	Most Ineffective

Table No. 1.2 represented the levels of Teaching Effectiveness among secondary school teachers. The table shows that 67.34% of secondary school teachers fall under most effective teaching, 15.06% are highly effective in teaching, 7.12% are above average in effective teaching and 4.70% of secondary school teachers fall under moderately effective teaching. It is also seen that 2.82% are below average effective in teaching, 2.15% very ineffective in teaching, where the most ineffective teaching includes 0.81% of secondary school teachers. This implies that majority (67.34%) of secondary school teachers are most effective in teaching.

Objective 2: To find out the difference in Social-Emotional Competence among the following groups:

- (a) male and female
- (b) rural and urban
- (c) types of school management
- (d) teaching experiences

To find out the Social-Emotional Competency between (a) male and female (b) rural and urban (c) types of school management and (d) teaching experiences of secondary school teachers, the data was analysed using both descriptive statistics such as mean, standard deviation and inferential statistics '*t*' test and '*F*' test. The analysis and interpretation of the objective is discussed as follow:

(a) Social-Emotional Competence between male and female secondary school teachers

H₀1 There is no significant difference in the Social-Emotional Competency between male and female secondary school teachers

In order to find out the level of significant difference between male and female secondary school teachers, the data has been analysed and interpreted using 't' test. The 't-value' was set at 0.05 level of significance with $df = 742$ is 1.96. It is represented in the Table No. 1.3.

Table No. 1.3

Difference between male and female secondary school teachers in Social-Emotional Competency

Gender	N	Mean	SD	df	't'	Level of Significance (0.05)
Male	282	233.91	17.69	742	2.48	Significant
Female	462	237.11	16.68			

Table No. 1.3 shows that 't value' 2.48 with $df=742$ is significant at 0.05 level. Hence, the stated null hypothesis, "There is no significant difference in the Social-Emotional Competency between male and female secondary school teachers" is rejected. This indicates that there is a difference in Social-Emotional Competency between male and female secondary school teachers and it implies that gender plays a role in determining their Social-Emotional Competency. It is also observed that the mean difference of 3.20 is in favour of female secondary school teachers.

(b) Social-Emotional Competence between rural and urban secondary school teachers

H₀₂ There is no significant difference in the Social-Emotional Competency between rural and urban secondary school teachers

In order to find out the level of significant difference between rural and urban secondary school teachers, the data has been analysed and interpreted using 't' test. The 't-value' was set at 0.05 level of significance with $df = 742$ is 1.96. It is represented in the Table No. 1.4.

Table No. 1.4

Difference between rural and urban secondary school teachers in Social-Emotional Competency

Locale	N	Mean	SD	df	't'	Level of Significance (0.05)
Rural	334	234.79	17.11	742	1.59	Not significant
Urban	410	236.80	17.10			

Table No. 1.4 shows that 't value' 1.59 with $df=742$ is not significant at 0.05 level. Hence, the stated null hypothesis, "There is no significant difference in the Social-Emotional Competency between rural and urban secondary school teachers" is retained. This indicates that there is no significant difference in Social-Emotional Competency between rural and urban secondary school teachers and it implies that locale does not play a role in determining their Social-Emotional Competency.

(c) Social-Emotional Competence of secondary school teachers based on types of school management

H₀₃ There is no significant difference in the Social-Emotional Competency between types of school management of secondary school teachers

In order to find out the level of significant difference between types of school management, the data has been analysed and interpreted using 'F' test. The 'F-value' was set at 0.05 level of significance with $df = 2, 741$ is 3.00. It is represented in the Table No. 1.5.

Table No. 1.5

Difference in Social-Emotional Competency among secondary school teachers based on types of school management

Source of Variation	Sums of Squares	df	Mean Square	F-Value	Level of Significance (0.05)
Between Groups	512.55	2	256.28	0.87	Not Significant
Within Groups	217307.30	741	293.26		
Total	217819.80	743			

Table No. 1.5 shows that the ' F -value' 0.87 for Government, Deficit and Adhoc secondary school teachers is not significant. Hence, the stated null hypothesis, "There is no significant difference in the Social-Emotional Competency between types of school management of secondary school teachers" is retained. This indicates that Social-Emotional Competency of secondary school teachers in Government, Deficit and Adhoc do not differ from one another and it implies that types of school management does not play a role in determining their Social-Emotional Competency of secondary school teachers.

(d) Social-Emotional Competence of secondary school teachers based on teaching experiences

H₀4 There is no significant difference in the Social-Emotional Competency between the teaching experiences of secondary school teachers

In order to find out the level of significant difference between the teaching experiences of secondary school teachers, the data has been analysed and interpreted using ' F ' test. The ' F -value' was set at 0.05 level of significance with $df= 6, 737$ is 2.11. This is represented in the Table No. 1.6.

Table No. 1.6

Difference in Social-Emotional Competency among secondary school teachers based on teaching experiences

Source of Variation	Sums of Squares	df	Mean Square	F-Value	Level of Significance (0.05)
Between Groups	1381.22	6	230.20	0.78	Not Significant
Within Groups	216438.60	737	293.68		
Total	217819.8	743			

Table No. 1.6, shows that the ' F ' value' 0.78 for 1-5 years, 6-10 years, 11-15 years, 16-20 years, 21-25 years, 26-30 years and 31-35 years of teaching experiences is not significant. Hence, the stated null hypothesis, "There is no significant difference in the Social-Emotional Competency between teaching experiences of secondary school teachers" is retained. This indicates that Social-Emotional Competency of secondary school teachers based on teaching experiences do not differ from one another and it implies that the length of teaching experience does not play a role in determining their Social-Emotional Competency of the secondary school teachers.

Objective 4: To find out the difference in Teaching Effectiveness among the following groups:

- (a) male and female
- (b) rural and urban
- (c) types of school management
- (d) teaching experiences

To find out the difference in Teaching Effectiveness between (a) male and female (b) rural and urban (c) types of school management and (d) teaching experiences. The data was analysed using both descriptive statistics such as mean, standard deviation and inferential statistics ' χ^2 '. The analysis and interpretation of the objective is discussed as follow:

(a) Teaching Effectiveness between male and female secondary school teachers

H₀₅ There is no significant difference in Teaching Effectiveness between male and female secondary school teachers.

In order to find out the level of significant difference between male and female secondary school teachers, the data has been analysed and interpreted using ' χ^2 ' test. The ' χ^2 -value' was set at 0.05 level of significance with $df = 6$ is 12.59. It is represented in the Table No. 1.7.

Table No. 1.7

Difference in Teaching Effectiveness between male and female secondary school teachers

Variable	Gender	df	Most Effective teacher		Highly Effective Teacher		Above Average Effective Teacher		Moderately Effective Teacher		Below Average Effective Teacher		Very Ineffective Teacher		Most Ineffective Teacher		χ^2 Value	Table value	Level of Significance (0.05)
			fo	fe	fo	fe	fo	fe	fo	fe	fo	fe	fo	fe	fo	fe			
Teaching Effectiveness	Male	6	171	189.9	52	42.5	22	20.1	15	13.3	14	8.0	5	6.1	3	2.3	15.20	12.59	Significant
	Female		330	311.1	60	69.5	31	32.9	20	21.7	7	13.0	11	9.9	3	3.7			

Table No. 1.7 shows that ' χ^2 value' 15.20 with $df=6$ is significant at 0.05 level. Hence, the stated null hypothesis, "There is no significant difference in Teaching Effectiveness between male and female secondary school teachers" is rejected. This indicates that there is a difference in Teaching Effectiveness between male and female secondary school teachers. This implies that gender plays a role in determining their Teaching Effectiveness between male and female secondary school teachers. It is also found that the mean difference of 16.06 is in favour of female secondary school teachers. Hence, it can be concluded that female teachers have higher Teaching Effectiveness compared to their male counterparts.

(b) Teaching Effectiveness between rural and urban secondary school teachers

H₀₆ There is no significant difference in Teaching Effectiveness between rural and urban secondary school teachers.

In order to find out the level of significant difference between rural and urban secondary school teachers, the data has been analysed and interpreted using ' χ^2 ' test. The ' χ^2 -value' was set at 0.05 level of significance with $df = 6$ is 12.59. It is represented in the Table No. 1.8.

Table No. 1.8

Difference in Teaching Effectiveness between rural and urban secondary school teachers

Variable	Locale	df	Most Effective teacher		Highly Effective Teacher		Above Average Effective Teacher		Moderately Effective Teacher		Below Average Effective Teacher		Very Ineffective Teacher		Most Ineffective Teacher		χ^2 Value	Table value	Level of Significance (0.05)
			fo	fe	fo	fe	fo	fe	fo	fe	fo	fe	fo	fe	fo	fe			
Teaching Effectiveness	Rural	6	202	224.9	57	50.3	32	23.8	17	18	14	9.4	7	7.2	5	2.7	18.81	12.59	Significant
	Urban		299	276.1	55	61.7	21	29.2	18	19.3	7	11.6	9	8.8	1	3.3			

Table No. 1.8 shows that ' χ^2 value' 18.81 with $df=6$ is significant at 0.05 level. Hence, the stated null hypothesis, "There is no significant difference in Teaching Effectiveness between rural and urban secondary school teachers" is rejected. This indicates that there is a difference in Teaching Effectiveness between rural and urban secondary school teachers and it implies that locale plays a role in determining their Teaching Effectiveness. It is also found that the mean difference of 17.45 is in favour of urban secondary school teachers. This implies that urban teachers have higher Teaching Effectiveness as compared to the rural secondary school teachers.

(c) Teaching Effectiveness of secondary school teachers based on types of school management

H₀: There is no significant difference in Teaching Effectiveness between types of school management of secondary school teachers

In order to find out the level of significant difference between the types of school management of secondary school teachers, the data has been analysed and interpreted using ' χ^2 ' test. The ' χ^2 -value' was set at 0.05 level of significance with $df = 6$ is 12.59 for Government and Deficit, Government and Adhoc and Deficit and Adhoc secondary school teachers. This is presented in the Table No. 1.9.

Table No. 1.9

Difference in Teaching Effectiveness among secondary school teachers based on types of school management

Variable	Management	df	Most Effective teacher		Highly Effective Teacher		Above Average Effective Teacher		Moderately Effective Teacher		Below Average Effective Teacher		Very Ineffective Teacher		Most Ineffective Teacher		χ^2 Value	Table value	Level of Significance (0.05)
			fo	fe	fo	fe	fo	fe	fo	fe	fo	fe	fo	fe	fo	fe			
Teaching Effectiveness	Government	6	35	35.3	9	8.9	2	3.0	0	1.0	1	.6	2	.8	1	.4	4.64	12.59	Not Significant
	Deficit		214	213.7	54	54.1	19	18.0	7	6.0	3	3.4	4	5.2	2	2.6			
	Government	6	35	32.5	9	6.6	2	3.9	0	3.2	1	2.0	2	1.4	1	5	7.49	12.59	Not Significant
	Adhoc		252	254.5	49	51.4	32	30.1	28	24.8	17	16.0	10	10.6	3	3.5			
	Deficit	6	214	204.0	54	45.6	19	21.6	7	14.3	3	8.6	4	6.5	2	2.4	21.01	12.59	Significant
	Adhoc		252	262.5	49	58.0	32	28.7	28	19.7	17	11.3	10	7.9	3	2.8			

Table No. 1.9 shows that ' χ^2 value' 4.64 with $df=6$ for government and deficit and ' χ^2 value' 7.49 with $df=6$ for government and adhoc secondary school teachers is not significant at 0.05 level. Hence, the stated null hypothesis, "There is no significant difference in Teaching Effectiveness between types of school management of secondary school teachers" is accepted for government and deficit, government and adhoc secondary school teachers. On the other hand, the ' χ^2 value' 21.01 with $df=6$ for deficit and adhoc secondary school teachers is found significant at 0.05 level. Hence, the stated null hypothesis, "There is no significant difference in teaching

Effectiveness between types of school management of secondary school teachers” is rejected. This indicates that there is a difference in Teaching Effectiveness between types of school management of secondary school teachers. This implies that types of school management play a role in determining their teaching effectiveness. It is also found that the mean difference 19.12 between deficit and adhoc is in favour of deficit secondary school teachers.

(d) Teaching Effectiveness of secondary school teachers based on Teaching Experiences

H₀₈ There is no significant difference in Teaching Effectiveness between teaching experiences of secondary school teachers

In order to find out the level of significant difference of Teaching Effectiveness based on teaching experiences of secondary school teachers, the data has been analysed and interpreted using ‘ χ^2 ’ test. The ‘ χ^2 -value’ was set at 0.05 level of significance with $df = 6$ is 12.59 for each pair of group ranges from 1 to 5 years, 6 to 10 years, 11 to 15 years, 16 to 20 years, 21 to 25 years, 26 to 30 years and 31 to 35 years of teaching experiences among secondary school teachers. This is presented in the Table No. 1.10.

Table No. 1.10

Difference in Teaching Effectiveness among secondary school teachers based on teaching experiences

Variable	Teaching Experience	df	Most Effective teacher		Highly Effective Teacher		Above Average Effective Teacher		Moderately Effective Teacher		Below Average Effective Teacher		Very Ineffective Teacher		Most Ineffective Teacher		χ^2 Value	Table value	Level of Significance (0.05)
			fo	fe	fo	fe	fo	fe	fo	fe	fo	fe	fo	fe	fo	fe			
Teaching Effectiveness	1 – 5 yrs	6	104	113.0	23	24.1	13	12.3	11	7.9	12	5.8	3	3.4	2	1.5	8.53	12.59	Not Significant
	6 – 10 yrs		125	116.0	26	24.9	12	12.7	5	8.1	0	6.2	4	3.6	1	1.5			
	1 – 5 yrs	6	104	110.0	23	24.6	13	12.9	11	8.8	12	8.2	3	2.3	2	1.2	16.95	12.59	Significant
	11–15 yrs		84	78.0	19	17.4	9	9.1	4	6.2	2	5.8	1	1.7	0	.8			
	1–5 yrs	6	104	102.4	23	27.8	13	12.8	11	9.5	12	8.3	3	5.0	2	2.2	7.99	12.59	Not Significant
	16–20 yrs		81	82.6	27	22.2	10	9.5	6	7.5	3	6.7	6	4.7	2	1.8			
	1 – 5 yrs	6	104	105.3	23	20.9	13	13.9	11	13.2	12	9.8	3	3.5	2	1.4	4.99	12.59	Not Significant
	21–25 yrs		47	45.7	7	9.1	7	6.1	8	5.8	2	4.2	2	1.5	0	.6			
	1 – 5 yrs	6	104	112.3	23	20.8	13	11.2	11	8.9	12	10.4	3	2.2	2	2.2	8.42	12.59	Not Significant
	26–30 yrs		48	39.7	5	7.2	2	3.8	1	3.1	2	3.6	0	.8	1	.8			
	1 – 5 yrs	6	104	105.8	23	25.3	13	11.7	11	9.9	12	10.8	3	2.7	2	1.8	6.81	12.59	Not Significant
	31–35 yrs		12	10.3	5	2.7	0	1.3	0	1.1	0	1.2	0	.2	0	.2			
	6 – 10 yrs	6	125	123.7	26	26.7	12	12.5	5	5.3	0	1.2	4	3.0	1	.6	4.67	12.59	Not Significant
	11–15 yrs		84	85.3	19	18.3	9	8.5	4	3.7	2	.8	1	2.0	0	.4			
	6 – 10 yrs	6	125	115.5	26	29.9	12	12.4	5	6.2	0	1.7	4	5.6	1	1.7	4.51	12.59	Not Significant
	16–20 yrs		81	89.5	27	24.1	10	9.6	6	4.8	3	1.3	6	4.4	2	1.3			
	6 – 10 yrs		125	121.0	26	23.2	12	13.4	5	9.1	0	1.4	4	4.2	1	.7	11.67	12.59	Not Significant
	21–25 yrs	6	47	51.0	7	9.8	7	5.6	8	3.9	2	.6	2	1.8	0	.3			
	6 – 10 yrs	6	125	128.8	26	23.2	12	10.5	5	4.5	0	1.5	4	3.0	1	1.5	10.84	12.59	Not Significant
	26–30 yrs		48	43.2	5	7.8	2	4.5	1	1.5	2	.5	0	1.0	1	.5			
	6 – 10 yrs		125	125.0	26	28.1	12	10.9	5	4.5	0	.1	4	3.5	1	.9			Not

31–35 yrs	6	12	12.0	5	2.9	0	1.1	0	.5	0	.2	0	.2	0	.1	3.92	12.59	Significant
11–15 yrs	6	84	77.1	19	21.6	9	8.9	4	4.7	2	2.4	1	3.3	0	1	6.85	12.59	Not Significant
16–20 yrs		81	87.9	27	24.4	10	10.1	6	5.3	3	2.6	6	3.6	2	1.1			
11–15 yrs	6	84	81.2	19	16.1	9	9.9	4	6.2	2	2.5	1	1.9	0	1.2	7.30	12.59	Not Significant
21–25 yrs		47	49.8	7	9.9	7	6.1	8	4.6	2	1.0	2	1.1	0	.5			
11–15 yrs	6	84	88.1	19	16.1	9	7.4	4	3.4	2	2.7	1	.7	0	.6	6.64	12.59	Not Significant
26–30 yrs		48	43.9	5	7.9	2	3.6	1	1.6	2	1.3	0	.4	1	.3			
11–15 yrs	6	84	84.3	19	20.8	9	7.8	4	3.5	2	1.7	1	.8	0	.1	3.67	12.59	Not Significant
31–35 yrs		12	11.7	5	3.2	0	1.2	0	.5	0	.2	0	.1	0	.1			
16–20 yrs	6	81	83.2	27	22.0	10	11.0	6	9.1	3	3.2	6	5.2	2	1.3	8.08	12.59	Not Significant
21–25 yrs		47	44.8	7	12.0	7	6.0	8	4.9	2	1.8	2	2.8	0	.7			
16–20 yrs	6	81	89.6	27	22.3	10	8.4	6	4.9	3	3.5	6	4.2	2	2.1	10.73	12.59	Not Significant
26–30 yrs		48	39.4	5	9.7	2	3.6	1	2.1	2	1.5	0	1.8	1	.9			
16–20 yrs	6	81	83.0	27	28.2	10	8.8	6	5.3	3	2.6	6	5.3	2	1.8	4.47	12.59	Not Significant
31–35 yrs		12	10.0	5	3.8	0	1.2	0	.7	0	.4	0	.7	0	.2			
21–25 yrs	6	47	52.4	7	6.7	7	5.0	8	5.0	2	2.2	2	1.1	0	.6	9.97	12.59	Not Significant
26–30 yrs		48	42.6	5	5.3	2	4.0	1	4.0	2	1.8	0	.9	1	.4			
21–25 yrs	6	47	48.2	7	9.6	7	5.6	8	6.4	2	1.6	2	1.0	0	.6	8.44	12.59	Not Significant
31–35 yrs		12	10.8	5	2.4	0	1.4	0	.6	0	1.0	0	.4	0	.4			
26–30 yrs	6	48	46.8	5	7.6	2	1.4	1	.8	2	1.5	0	.1	1	.8	5.83	12.59	Not Significant
31–35 yrs		12	13.2	5	2.2	0	.5	0	.2	0	.5	0	.2	0	.2			

Table No. 1.10 shows that the calculated ' χ^2 -values' in the difference of teaching experiences of teachers (between 1-5 years and 6-10 years, 1-5 years and 16-20 years, 1-5 years and 21-25 years, 1-5 years and 26-30 years, 1-5 years and 31-35 years, 6-10 years and 11-15 years, 6-10 years and 16-20 years, 6-10 years and 21-25 years, 6-10 years and 26-30 years, 6-10 years and 31-35 years, 11-15 years and 16-20 years, 11-15 and 21-25 years, 11-15 and 26-30 years, 11-15 and 31-35 years, 16-20 years and 21-25 years, 16-20 years and 26-30 years, 16-20 years and 31-35 years, 21-25 years and 26-30 years, 21-25 years and 31-35 years, 26-30 years and 31-35 years) were found to be not significant with the table value. Hence, the stated null hypothesis, "There is no significant difference in Teaching Effectiveness between teaching experiences of secondary school teachers" for these 20 pairs of teaching experiences is accepted. On the other hand, ' χ^2 -value'= 16.95 for 1-5 years and 11-15 years of teaching experience is significant. Therefore the stated null hypothesis, "There is no significant difference in Teaching Effectiveness between teaching experiences of secondary school teachers" is rejected for these teaching experience. The mean difference of 29.02 is in favour of teachers with 11-15 years of teaching experience. This implies that teaching experience plays an important role on Teaching Effectiveness of secondary school teachers.

Objective 4: To study the relationship between Teachers' Social-Emotional Competency and Teaching Effectiveness.

In order to find out the relationship between Teachers' Social-Emotional Competency and Teaching Effectiveness, the data collected were analysed using mean, standard deviation and Pearson Product Moment Coefficient of Correlation (r).

H₀9 There is no significant relationship between Teachers' Social-Emotional Competency and Teaching Effectiveness of secondary school teachers.

To test the stated null hypothesis the level of relationship was set at 0.01 level with $df=742$ is 0.088. Table No. 1.11 shows the tested hypothesis.

Table No. 1.11

Relationship between Teachers' Social-Emotional Competency and Teaching Effectiveness of secondary school teachers

Category	N	Mean	SD	Df	r	Level of difference
Teachers' Social-Emotional Competency	744	235.90	17.12	742	0.280	Significant at 0.01 level
Teaching Effectiveness	744	469.17	71.58			

Table No. 1.11 shows that $r = 0.280$ is significant at 0.01 level. This implies that there is a significant relationship between Teachers' Social-Emotional Competency and Teaching Effectiveness. The stated hypothesis, "There is no significant relationship between Teachers' Social-Emotional Competency and Teaching Effectiveness of secondary school teachers" is rejected. This indicates that there is a positive relationship between Teachers' Social-Emotional Competency and Teaching Effectiveness of secondary school teachers.

Major Findings and Suggestions

Objective 1: Social-Emotional Competency and Teaching Effectiveness of secondary school teachers.

Teachers' Social-Emotional Competency plays an important role in bringing about the successful teaching-learning process. However, the finding indicated that majority (23.66%) of secondary school teachers are average in Social-Emotional Competency. This is so, because both teachers and administrators lack the understanding on the close relationship of Social-Emotional Competency and classroom performance of the teachers. It is observed that social relationship and emotional competency of teachers bears the responsibility towards successful teaching. Teachers who are able to regulate themselves socially, have the ability to understand the capacity of others and know how to interact with them effectively, as well as possess higher ability to deliver a more effective teaching. Such teachers also have the potential to establish social relation and attachment with the students. Therefore, it is suggested that both administrators and teachers should be aware of the necessary criteria related to Social-Emotional Competency. In order to promote this ability towards different sections of educational machineries such as administrators and teachers, therefore, educational agencies such as National Council for Teacher Education (NCTE), National Council of Educational Research and Training (NCERT) and State Council of Educational Research and Training (SCERT)/Directorate of Educational Research and Training (DERT) are needed to place emphasis on the Social-Emotional Competency of teachers while framing specific curriculum and provide teacher

education accordingly. In this regard, Jennings (2017) also suggested that Cultivating Awareness and Resilience in Education (CARE) for teachers is an effective professional development both for promoting teachers' social and emotional competence.

With regard to Teaching Effectiveness, the study revealed that 89.52% (67.34% most effective, 15.06% highly effective and 7.12% above average effective teaching) of secondary school teachers were above average effective teaching, where 10.48% (4.70% moderately effective, 2.82% below average, 2.15% very ineffective and 0.81% most ineffective teaching) were moderate and below average effective teaching. This finding implies, though majority of teachers were highly effective in teaching, however it could not be ignored that many others were less effective while some were ineffective. These groups of teachers may affect negatively towards the students' achievement. The reasons for this low performance in teaching could be due to around 38% of secondary school teachers were untrained and 37.36% having below average TSEC. Therefore, it is necessary for the administration and government to insist on making teachers' education a compulsory qualification for those interested in the teaching profession. It is also suggested that administration should make it mandatory for each and every teacher to update themselves with new or contemporary teaching strategies and apply the same in the classroom. Therefore, opportunities must be opened for every teacher to pursue several programmes such as seminar, conference, workshop and refresher courses. In-service training should be conducted for teachers once a year either by the school administration or by the educational agencies.

Objective 2: Difference in Social-Emotional Competence among the following groups:

- (a) male and female
- (b) rural and urban
- (c) types of school management
- (d) teaching experiences

The present study revealed that there was no significant difference in Social-Emotional Competency based on locality, types of school management and teaching experiences of secondary school teachers. However, with respect to genders the finding showed that there was a significant difference in Social-Emotional Competency between male and female secondary school teachers. It also observed that the difference was in favour of female secondary school teachers. The probable reason may be because female teachers were more collaborative in nature than male. For example, men are known to be less emotionally expressive than women (Brody & Hall, 2000) and score lower on emotional intelligence tests than women (Brackett, et al., 2006). Thus, teachers should maintain their desire to promote self-awareness, professional orientation, intrapersonal and interpersonal management. In order to develop high Social-Emotional Competency towards teachers especially for male teachers, activity-based instruction or programmes such as classroom activities, workshop, conference, sports and games and study tour that involved each teachers should be organised. These types of activities would enable teachers to acquire related skills both in social relationship and emotional understanding towards others.

Objective 3: Difference in Teaching Effectiveness among the following groups:

- (a) male and female
- (b) rural and urban
- (c) types of school management
- (d) teaching experiences

The finding of the present study pointed out that there was a significant difference in Teaching Effectiveness between male and female teachers. It was also indicated that female secondary school teachers were more effective than male. This is so because male teachers were higher in number of untrained teachers as compared to female teachers. Therefore, though concentration of providing training must be catered to all, however government must provide more opportunities to male teachers. In order to make teaching more effective it can be suggested that government should encourage teachers' education by providing incentives and honorarium in the salary for those teachers with higher teacher educational/professional qualification.

The finding also indicated that there was significant difference between urban and rural secondary school teachers. Teachers in urban areas were more effective in teaching than teachers from rural secondary schools. Based on the observation it was found that teachers from rural areas have limited teaching resources. It was also found that there was scarcity of facilities for adequate teaching in these areas such as adequate school buildings and other classroom facilities. Thus, in addition to the improvement of educational quality administration and government must cater the needs of rural teachers such as proper school buildings and teaching learning materials. Further, special attention is also needed to be given in developing student-friendly classroom by the school administration where teachers can plan and carry out classroom activities without hindrances. It may also be suggested that the state government in order to enhance students' participation and positive classroom environment should provide workshop for secondary school teachers in developing teaching learning materials and also the skills of employing them in the classroom learning to make learning more effective. In order to make their teaching more effective teachers must concentrate more on the teaching-learning related activities and spend less of their time on other activities such as file work and office work. Hence, to attract competent and effective people to the field of teaching it is required that the salary of the teachers be enhance and equal to the work done.

The finding pointed out that there was no significant difference in Teaching Effectiveness between Government and Deficit, Government and Adhoc secondary school teachers, but the Teaching Effectiveness was found to be significant between Deficit and Adhoc secondary school teachers. These differences existed due to segregation of benefits between different types of schools which affect the performance of teachers in their jobs. Thus, it is suggested that in order to bring quality education to all the students, equal treatment to all teachers must be taken. Hence, salary of the teachers should be the same for all according to their educational qualification and teaching experiences in spite of different types of school management to make teaching more effective. Further, it is suggested that government and administration must come into a consensus agreement that only one type of school management must be prevailed throughout the state.

Further, the finding of the study revealed that there were no significant differences in Teaching Effectiveness based on teaching experiences, except teachers with experience of 1-5 years and 11-15 years in

teaching. This implies that though Teaching Effectiveness differs from one group to another, generally the finding revealed that teaching experience was slightly affected on Teaching Effectiveness. The reason is that teachers with long years experienced were left in teaching profession without proper regeneration of teaching strategies. Teachers also did not update themselves with the new trends of teaching profession. Though, teachers may expose an expertise in subject contents but they tend to follow traditional method and forgetting the teaching skills acquired in the long years of training. Hence, it is important that all teachers be engaged from time to time with various activities related to teaching strategies. Government should create an opportunities for teachers to attend programmes to refresh and enhance their skills and provide experiences that would help them to be more productive and effective teachers. It may be also suggested that the government or any other agencies when conducting workshops and programmes for the teachers should also follow up on the progress made by the teachers in the classroom so as to make the programme and workshop successful and also ensuring the effectiveness of the teachers in the classroom.

Objective 4: Relationship between Teachers' Social-Emotional Competency and Teaching Effectiveness.

The finding revealed that when Teachers' Social-Emotional Competency is high, Teaching Effectiveness will also increase. The Ministry of Education document Challenge of Education: A Policy Perspective (1985) has mentioned, "Teacher performance is the most crucial input in the field of education". Therefore, it is suggested that in order to increase teaching behaviour, teaching performance also must go side by side with Social-Emotional Competency among secondary school teachers. Teachers who are socially and emotionally balanced have the capacity to generate new ideas and adopt new methods of teaching. Thus, it is suggested that teachers should take advantage from various courses organised by the Ministry of Education in imparting teachers' education through different agencies like NCTE, NCERT, SCERT/DERT, RIE and others in order to enhance Social-Emotional Competency to each secondary school teachers with a purpose of increasing Teaching Effectiveness.

Conclusion

Teachers' Social-Emotional Competency is an important set of behaviours that enable the teachers to address the challenges in today's educational climate. The present study on "A study on social-emotional competency and teaching effectiveness of secondary school teachers in Meghalaya" has a great impact on the need of dynamic and proficiency teachers in the school system. After having proper investigation on the study, it was found that there is a significant positive relationship between Social-Emotional Competency (SEC) in relation to Classroom Behaviour and Teaching Effectiveness of secondary school teachers. It is also seen that there is a connection with classroom management, types of schools, gender and location of the schools. Further, the study recommended that teachers with low TSEC are less effective in delivering information, less meaningful interactional and less effective in using various teaching skills. This affects adversely to the quality of education in various sections including teachers, students and others stakeholders within an educational system. However, the present study revealed that those teachers who possess high TSEC having more resiliency and higher productive outcomes from their works. Therefore, providing supports and maintenance towards improvement of teachers' social-emotional competency would not only help the teachers but uplifted the quality of education as a whole.

REFERENCES

- Alhassan, A. J. (2015). An evaluation of head teachers' performance in supervision of instruction and involvement of staff in decision-making in the school. *International Journal of Research in Humanities and Social Studies*; 2(7). 129-142.
- Bhattacharya, S. P. (1974). Review of research on theory of teaching. As in Singh, N. (1988). *Modernisation of Teacher Education*. New Delhi, Commonwealth Publisher.
- Brackett, M. A., Rivers, S. E., Shiffman, S., Lerner, N., & Salovey, P. (2006). Relating emotional abilities to social functioning: A comparison of self-report and performance measures of emotional intelligence. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 91(4), 780-795.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/00223514.91.4.780>
- Brody, L. R., & Hall, J. A. (2000). Gender, emotion, and expression. As in Lewis, M., & Haviland, J. M, (Eds.). *Handbook of emotions* (2nd Ed.). New York. NY:Guilford.
- Goddard, R. D., Hoy, W. K., & Woolfolk H. A. (2004). Collective efficacy beliefs: Theoretical developments, empirical evidence, and future directions. *Educational Researcher*, 33, 3-13.
- Jennings, P. A. (2017). Impacts of the CARE for teachers program on teachers' social and emotional competence and classroom interactions. *Journal of Educational Psychology*. 1010-1028.
- Jennings, P. A., & Greenberg, M. T. (2009). The prosocial classroom: Teacher social and emotional competence in relation to student and classroom outcomes. *Review of Educational Research*, 79(1), 491-525.
- Kulsum, U. (2011). *Teacher Effectiveness Scale (TES-ku)*. Agra. National Psychological Corporation.
- Kumar, T. P. (2012). *Advanced methods of teaching*. New Delhi. Himalaya publishing house.
- Moll, L. C. (Ed.). (2003). *Vygotsky and Education: Instructional implications and applications of sociohistorical psychology*. United Kingdom. Cambridge University Press.